

Amendments to the Drawings:

The drawing sheet attached in connection with the above-identified application containing Figures 2 and 3 is being presented as a new formal drawing sheet to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet. The drawing Figure 2 has been amended. Appended to this amendment is an annotated copy of the previous drawing sheet which has been marked to show changes presented in the replacement sheet of the drawing.

The specific changes which have been made to Figure 2 are to replace numeral “20” with numeral “16” and to more clearly illustrate winding of the cords on the spool.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

The interview of July 18 as well as the comments of Supervisory Patent Examiner Matecki and Examiner Dondero are sincerely appreciated. The Examiner's Interview Summary accurately summarizes the interview. This Supplemental Amendment reflects discussion at the interview.

In the specification, paragraphs have been amended on page 6.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 2, and 4-17 are now pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 1,163,983 (hereafter "Peene") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,830,647 (hereafter "Watabe"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Conventional processes that provide multiple elongated elements from a spool at the same time experience problems, such as sagging of the elements that leads to entanglement of the elements, dragging and damaging of the elements, or inconsistencies in a product manufactured from the elements. Applicants' invention advantageously permits unwinding of multiple elongated steel elements from a spool with a minimum amount of sagging. Also, by providing spools with such multiple elongated steel elements, fewer spools can be used in a creel that supplies elongated elements to a manufacturing process and the flexibility of a creel is increased.

Peene discloses an apparatus for winding multiple strands onto a reel so that the lengths of the strands are approximately equal, despite differences in strand diameter that can lead to different wound lengths on a reel. See Peene at page 2, lines 27-59. However, the apparatus of Peene does not wind multiple strands so that they are wound closely to one another along the length of the strands.

Watabe discloses a process in which elements are wound in a zigzag fashion to form a cake 8 with a trapezoidal cross-section. See Watabe at col. 4, lines 15-52. The process of Watabe advantageously addresses the problems of poor strand integrity and low productivity. See Watabe at col. 1, lines 42-68; col. 2, lines 1-58. Therefore, the problems addressed by Watabe are different from those addressed by Peene. Moreover, the method of Watabe is for winding glass yarns. See Watabe at col. 1, lines 6-11. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to modify the apparatus of Peene by the teachings of Watabe in order to overcome the deficiencies of Peene because Watabe addresses different problems than Peene for a different material. Nor would one of ordinary skill in the art have looked to the teachings of Watabe to solve problems addressed by Applicant's invention because Watabe addresses different problems for a completely different material. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Additional discussion regarding the patentability of the claims is set forth in Applicants' Amendment of July 18, 2006 and the Examiner is respectfully referred to this discussion.

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peene in view of Watabe as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,187,841 (hereafter "Pierce"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Pierce fails to remedy the deficiencies of Peene and Watabe. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 8/15/06

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5426
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 

Glenn Law
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,371

ANNOTATED SHEET
TO SHOW
CHANGES MADE

